

## **STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT, FACULTY OF SCIENCE EDUCATION, MAKASSAR STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Ermi Sola**

Alauddin State University, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Email: [ermisola18@gmail.com](mailto:ermisola18@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This study aimed to determine whether there was a correlation between the level of students' understanding of SBM (School Based Management) and students' attitudes towards SBM in the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University. This research was a correlational research. The total population was 180 students and 42 of them were selected as samples taken through purposive random sampling technique. The research data were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The results showed that there was a significant correlation between students' understanding and their attitudes towards SBM. It can be concluded that the higher the level of students' understanding of School Based Management, the more positive their attitude towards School Based Management.

**Keywords:** Attitude; School Based Management; Understanding

### **INTRODUCTION**

Since the reform era, various policies and decisions have been issued by the government that have brought major changes, including in the field of education. For example Republic of Indonesia Law Number 22 of 2000 and Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2000 which regulate the authority of the central government and the authority of the

Province as autonomous regions. The two regulations also contain logical consequences for education, namely the change of Central-Based Management to School-based Management.

This is interesting to study because there are assumptions why school-based management is important to implement. First, schools are seen as non-profit educational service institutions in which the principal is the education manager. As a manager, the principal is responsible for all components of the school. The principal must be able to improve service quality and school achievements, both internal and external. Internal achievement is related to student learning achievement, and external achievement is related to the community around the school, stake holders, and industrial institutions (world of work). Furthermore, school-based management will be effectively implemented if it is supported by a system of power sharing between the central government and local/provincial governments in school management. Finally, schools know best about the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats so that they can strive to optimize all the resources they have in order to develop and advance the school.

The bureaucratic and centralized system in our education system is one of the reasons for the deteriorating quality of

education. Schools where the principal and teachers cannot carry out activities freely (develop creativity). They are controlled and helpless (Danim, 2006).

Conceptually, school-based management is a school management model that provides autonomy to schools and emphasizes joint/ participatory school decisions from all school members in order to improve the quality of education based on national education policies. SBM provides the possibility for schools to have great authority in managing their schools to be more creative so they can develop programs that are more suitable to the needs and potential of the school (Syukur, 2011).

In general, school-based management is an attempt to 1) delegate school organization and governance, 2) empower people who have close relationships with schools, namely teachers, parents and school principals, 3) create new roles and responsibilities for all those involved in school-based management, and 4) transforming the teaching and learning process that takes place in the classroom (Kubic & Kathleen, 1998).

Several studies have been conducted related to this School Based Management. First, the results of study from Suprihatin, Akbar, and Supriyati, (2017) which showed that 1) curriculum management was integrated between the curriculum of the Ministry of Education and Culture and the curriculum of Islamic boarding schools. 2) personnel management (for) educators, 3) student management was divided into two parts, namely teaching and parenting, 4) financial management was managed by *LKMS La Tansa Mandiri*, 5) infrastructure

management, 6) public relations management, 7) management of services such as libraries, laboratories, health clinics, dormitories, and business units; and 8) monitoring and evaluation management in the form of a team consisting of the principal, committee and teaching section. All the above points were managed by school-based management.

Next, Winarti (2011) put forward the idea that school-based management allowed the distribution of authority from the central government to local governments. In addition, she concluded that the implementation of school-based management actually creates problems.

Lastly, a study conducted by Lazwardi (2018). This study focused on the implementation of school-based management. He reported that the implementation of school-based management was essentially the provision of autonomy to schools with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of education. School-based management guaranteed schools to manage all resources and funds and allocate them according to school needs. In addition, the aim of school-based management was to increase the efficiency of the quality of education in an independent and flexible manner in managing the available resources. Furthermore, there were eight components of school-based management, namely curriculum management and teaching programs, education staff management, student management, financial management, infrastructure management, public relations management, and special service management.

The results of the three studies and articles above are different from the research that the researchers conducted.

The differences are first, the three articles only discussed the implementation of school-based management. Second, the researchers only looked at how school-based management was implemented and its relationship with school-based management components. Third, the three researchers did not see the role of students in implementing school-based management. Finally, the three researchers did not investigate the relationship between school-based management and other variables. These four reasons show the difference between the research that the researcher did and the three previous researchers where the results of this study show its strength and novelty because 1) this study involved students majoring in Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, 2) this study tried to see the level of understanding of students majoring in Educational Administration, Faculty of Education on school-based management, 3) This research involved psychological variables, namely attitudes.

Different from the reality on the ground that the implementation of school-based management is not as expected. The implementation of school-based management has been slow at the primary to secondary education levels. One of the assumptions is the lack of understanding of school-based management, especially the understanding of students majoring in Education Administration which focuses on improving the quality of education.

Based on the assumption that by understanding school-based management, students majoring in Education Administration, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University would have a positive attitude towards school-based management. Thus, this research was

conducted with the aim of knowing whether there was a positive relationship between understanding and attitudes of students, especially those in the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University on school-based management.

## **METHOD**

This research used a quantitative survey approach (Creswell, 2012). This research was conducted at the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University. The population of this research was 180 students. Samples were taken by using purposive sampling technique. A total of 42 students in semesters 4 and 6 who have obtained school-based management courses were selected as samples.

The research instrument was a questionnaire that was used to collect data of the understanding and attitudes of students majoring in educational administration towards school-based management. The questionnaire had 4 categories (Likert scale); very good (score 4), good (score 3), fair (score 2), and bad (score 1). In this case, school-based management indicators were focused on mastering 3 pillars, namely management, the teaching-learning process, and community participation. Attitudes were focused on feeling like / dislike, happy or unhappy with the school-based management program.

The questionnaire was validated by using expert validation techniques (Creswell, 2012). Where each questionnaire item had been read and corrected by two experts. Meanwhile, to see whether the questionnaire was reliable or not, the questionnaire has been tried out.

The response to the try out results was analyzed using reliability analysis with a Cronbach alpha value of 0.8.

Then, the data obtained were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to describe the level of understanding and attitudes of students towards school-based management. Meanwhile, inferential statistical analysis in the form of Pearson Product Moment Correlation was conducted to find the relationship between students' understanding and attitudes towards school-based management.

## FINDINGS

The results of descriptive statistical analysis of the results of students' responses to questionnaires to see students' understanding of school-based management showed that the highest score was 93, the lowest was 34, the range was 59, and the mean was 65.2. The details are in table 1 below.

**Table 1**  
**Students' Understanding of School Based Management**

Category	Interval	Frequency	Percent age
Very good	79-93	8	19.05%
Good	64-78	15	35.71%
Fair	49-63	13	30.95%
Bad	34-48	6	14.29%
Amount (N)		42	100%

From table 1 it can be seen that students' understanding of school-based management still needs to be improved. This was because only 54.76% of the 42

sample people were in the very good and good categories. Meanwhile, 45.24% in the fair and bad categories.

Furthermore, from the results of descriptive statistical analysis of students' responses to questionnaires showing student attitudes towards school-based management, the results showed that the highest score was 99, the lowest was 50, the range was 49, and the mean was 74.95. In detail, it is in table 2 below.

**Table 2**  
**Students' Attitudes towards School Based Management**

Category	Interval	Frequency	Percent age
Very good	88-100	6	14.29%
Good	75-87	16	38.10%
Fair	62-74	15	35.71%
Bad	49-61	5	11.90%
Amount (N)		42	100%

From the data in Table 2 it can be seen that students' attitudes towards school-based management still need to be improved. This was because only 14.26% or 6 of the 42 samples of people had very positive attitudes towards school-based management, 38.10% or 16 of 42 people were positive, 35.71% or 15 of the 42 samples were quite positive, and 11.90% or 5 of 42 people behaved very badly to school based management.

At the end, from the results of data analysis to show the correlation between students' understanding and attitudes towards school-based management were analyzed by using the inferential Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistics, which showed that there was a significant

correlation between students' understanding and attitudes towards school-based management where the R value was calculated. 0.852 is more than R table 0.304 with  $N = 42$  at  $\alpha 0.05$ . at the significance level  $\alpha 0.05$ .

## DISCUSSION

Conceptually, the students in semester 4 and 6 had received school-based management courses. However, the results showed that there were several assumptions or reasons why students' understanding of school-based management still needs to be improved. Among them were 1) students are not serious during PBM, 2) students were not active, 3) the way the lecturer teaches was not attractive — conventional techniques; not student-centered, 4) lecturers did not master the material, 5) lecturers focused on mastering school-based management theory; lack of practical elements such as giving “project” assignments seeing the implementation of school-based management in certain schools, and 6) lecturers focusing more on one aspect of school-based management (learning); did not touch the other two aspects; management and public relations.

These six assumptions could influence students' attitudes towards school-based management. It was possible that students with high scores on school-based management had very good attitudes towards school-based management, or vice versa. This argument was strengthened by the results of the Critical Values for Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The results showed that there was a significant correlation between students' understanding and attitudes towards school-based management. The

result meant that the higher the students' understanding of school-based management, the better or positive the students' attitude towards school-based management.

The conclusion above was reinforced by the opinion of Mulyasa (2004) that school-based management could be implemented effectively and efficiently if the four management functions are integrated. These functions were planning, organizing, implementing, supervising. 1) Planning was a systematic process in making decisions related to actions to be taken. Planning was formulated based on data. Educational planning manages various activities in an effort to achieve educational goals. 2) Organizing was related to how the planning is organized or formulated by a systematic procedure. 3) Implementation was related to the implementation of planning by empowering the resources owned by the school in a professional manner. 4) Supervision controlled how planning was implemented properly.

In more detail, the implementation of school-based management required 9 strategies to get optimal results (Slamet, 2000). These strategies were 1) Socialization of community school-based management concepts such as school principals, teachers, parents, supervisors, and stake holders. This socialization could be done through seminars, training, Focus Group Discussion (FGD), scientific forums, and parents. 2) Internal and external analysis of schools in order to face the reality of the change from center-based management to school-based management. 3) Formulation of situational objectives and readiness criteria for each function. 4) Identification of important



functions involved in achieving goals, namely the curriculum, teachers and other staff, students. 5) Determining the readiness of each function through a SWOT analysis. 6) Best solution selection; from an unprepared function to be ready or from weakness and threat to strength and opportunity. 7) Short, medium, and long term planning and programs based on priority scales. 8) Implementing the program by considering inputs. 9) Process control and evaluation of school based management results.

Decentralization was a school-based management concept that emphasizes 1) school flexibility in making decisions that are appropriate / approaching school needs, 2) accountability to parents, stake holders, and parents were increasing, 3) school performance would increase, especially quality, effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, innovation, and character (Bailey as cited in Sunset: 2000). Volansky and Friedman (2003) suggested 5 conditions for successful school-based management; 1) supported by the school community as a whole, 2) implemented sustainably, 3) school staff should be trained on how to adapt to new roles and communication networks, 4) availability of financial support, and 5) transferred of power from the center to the principal, continuing to teachers and parents.

Attitudes were conceptually not reactions or activities. Attitudes were still in the form of behavioral predisposition or readiness to behave, not action. Cascio (1991) and Gibson (1996) suggested 5 dimensions of attitude. 1) direction (agree / disagree, positive / negative), 2) intensity (depth of attitude towards a certain object may not be the same even though the

direction is the same, 3) flexibility (disagreement with an object can occur in certain aspects), 4) consistency (suitability between attitude and response; a stable attitude means consistent; a volatile attitude means inconsistency), 5) spontaneous (to what extent a person's readiness to express their attitude spontaneously).

Therefore, the theories that supported the results of the study showed that understanding school-based management required a strategy that was taken into account other important functions and requirements. In addition, direction, consistency, flexibility, intensity, and breadth as part of attitudes are variables that determine the success of school-based management. However, socialization was often forgotten during the dissemination of school based management. Even in the classroom, teachers often ignore the importance of understanding school-based management, for example by assigning students a "class project" on how school-based management is implemented in schools. This situation would affected student attitudes towards school-based management.

## CONCLUSION

From the results of the study it can be concluded that there was a significant correlation between students' understanding and attitudes towards school-based management. In other words, the higher the students' understanding of school-based management, the better or positive the student's attitude towards school-based management.

## REFERENCE

- Cascio, W. F. (1991). *Applied Psychology in Personal Management*. Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall International Edition
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Danim, S. (2006). *Visi Baru Manajemen Sekolah; Dari Unit Birokrasi ke Lembaga Akademik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Gibson, J. T. (1996). *Psychology for the Classroom*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kubic, K. (1988). *School-Based Management*. ERIC Digest No. 33 Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearing House on Educational Management, Eugene.
- Lazwardi, D. (2018). Implementation of school based management. *Al Idarah: Jurnal Kependidikan Islam*. 8(1), p. 32-49. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24042/alidarah.v8i1.2973>
- Mulyasa, E. (2004). *Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah; Konsep, Strategi, dan Implementasi*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya
- Slamet, P. H. (2000). Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* No. 027 Nov.2000
- Suprihatin, R., Akbar, M., & Supriyati, Y. (2017). School Based Management at Pondok Pesantren La Tansa Lebak Banten. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Review (IJER)*. 4(2), p. 130-136. Retrieved from: [journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/ijer/article/view/5426](http://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/ijer/article/view/5426)
- Syukur, F. (2011). Manajemen pendidikan berbasis pada madrasah. Semarang: Pustaka Rizki
- Volansky, A. & Friedman, R. E. (2003). *School Based Management: An International Perspective*. Israel: Ministry of Education
- Winarti, E. (2011). School Based Management: The challenges of its implementation in Indonesia. *Jurnal Orientasi Baru*. 20(1), p. 85-106. Retrieved from: <https://ejournal.usd.ac.d/index.php/job/>